

RECHERCHES
LINGUISTIQUES
DE VINCENNES

Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes

33 | 2005

L'architecture propositionnelle, la syntaxe de la
périphérie gauche

In-situ wh-phrases in Spanish: locality and quantification

Ricardo Etxepare et Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria



Édition électronique

URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/rlv/1238>

DOI : 10.4000/rlv.1238

ISSN : 1958-9239

Éditeur

Presses universitaires de Vincennes

Édition imprimée

Date de publication : 1 mai 2005

Pagination : 9-34

ISBN : 2-84292-167-4

ISSN : 0986-6124

Référence électronique

Ricardo Etxepare et Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria, « In-situ wh-phrases in Spanish: locality and quantification », *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* [En ligne], 33 | 2005, mis en ligne le 16 septembre 2005, consulté le 01 mai 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/rlv/1238> ; DOI : 10.4000/rlv.1238

Ricardo ETXEPARE et Myriam URIBE-ETXEBARRIA
CNRS – UMR 5478 et University of the Basque Country

IN-SITU WH-PHRASES IN SPANISH:
LOCALITY AND QUANTIFICATION¹

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes *in-situ* wh-questions in Spanish. It argues that *in-situ* wh-phrases in Spanish are actually overtly moved to a left peripheral focus position, their postverbal position being the result of subsequent remnant movement past the focus position. The analysis defended here sets apart the *in-situ* phenomena of Spanish from the *in-situ* phenomena occurring in other Romance languages, such as French (as analyzed by Chang, 1997; Bošković, 2000; Cheng and Rooryck, 2000), and shows that the purported syntactic mechanisms underlying the distribution of *in-situ* wh-phrases in those languages are to be amended as far as Spanish is concerned. From a comparative perspective, the Spanish facts support a “pluralistic” approach to *in situ* strategies (Cheng and Rooryck, 2003), according to which the descriptive notion of *in-situ* phrase covers a heterogeneous grammatical domain. From a theoretical point of view, our analysis yields support for the idea that many of the phenomena analyzed in the GB tradition in terms of covert movement must be reanalyzed as instances of (masked) overt movement.

KEY-WORDS

Contrastive focus, covert movement, remnant movement, right dislocation, Spanish, *wh-in-situ*.

1. Strategies in question formation : the problem of optionality

1.1. Jiménez (1997)

A cross-linguistic look at question formation strategies will reveal at least three different types of languages: (i) languages with obligatory overt movement; (ii) languages with obligatory *in-situ* *wh*-phrases; and (iii) languages with both overt movement and *in-situ* strategies. French illustrates the last case in pairs such as (1) (Chang, 1997):

- (1) a. Qui as-tu vu?
b. Tu as vu qui?

Spanish also seems to have two different strategies of *wh*-question formation: one in which the *wh*-phrase moves to the left periphery of the sentence (2a); and one where it stays *in-situ* (2b) (Jiménez, 1997):

- (2) a. ¿Quién ha venido?
b. Ha venido ¿quién?

Jiménez (1997) proposes an account of (2a, b) where the *wh*-phrase optionally moves to the left periphery, the choice being driven by discourse factors, such as the restricted versus unrestricted nature of the domain over which *wh*-phrases range: in effect, *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish seem to quantify over heavily restricted domains, as opposed to overtly moved *wh*-phrases. Consider as an example the following dialogue (Jiménez, 1997 : 42):

- (3) Speaker A: Mi padre, mi madre y yo fuimos a la tienda a comprar huevos,
leche y café.
'My father, my mother and I went to the store to buy eggs,
milk and coffee.'
Mi madre compró los huevos.
'My mother bought the eggs.'
- (4) a. Speaker B: ¿Qué compró tu padre?
what bought your father
b. Speaker B: Y tu padre compró ¿qué?
and your father bought what

For an *in-situ* question such as (4b) to be felicitous, we need a context such as (3). Afterwards, speaker B can utter (4b), assuming that: (i) the father of Speaker A bought something; and (ii) the item bought comes from a pre-established set (the milk, eggs and coffee set). For Jiménez, (4a) and (4b) have different presuppositions, illustrated in (5a) and (5b) respectively:

- (5) a. $\{p: \exists(a) \in D [p = \text{bought}(f, x_1) \mid \mid \text{g}(a/x_1)]\}$
b. $\{p: \exists(a) \in \{\text{eggs, milk, coffee}\} [p = \text{bought}(f, x_1) \mid \mid \text{g}(a/x_1)]\}$

Whereas in (4a, 5a) the domain of quantification is the contextually restricted domain of individuals, in (4b, 5b) it is a designated set, itself a subset of the contextually restricted domain of individuals. The event presupposition pointed out by Jiménez, however, is not a side effect of the restricted quantification. First, observe that there is a subtle but nonetheless noticeable difference in the felicitousness of the following sentences:

- (6) a. Cuando compró algo, tu padre compró ¿qué?
 when he-bought something your father bought what
 b. ??Si compró algo, tu padre compró ¿qué?
 if he-bought something your father bought what
- (7) a. Cuando compró algo, ¿qué compró tu padre?
 when he-bought something what bought your father
 b. Si compró algo, ¿qué compró tu padre?
 if he-bought something what bought your father

Whereas in (6a, 7a) the clause initial temporal adjunct presupposes the existence of a buying event, in (6b, 7b) the conditional leaves open whether there was a buying or not. Whereas the temporal adjunct can be followed either by a preverbal or an *in-situ* *wh*-question, the conditional adjunct is degraded when followed by an *in-situ* *wh*-question. The effect does not arise with discourse-linked (Pesetsky, 1987; 2000) initial partitive *wh*-phrases, which quantify over designated, restricted sets:

- (8) Si compró algo, ¿cuál de esas tres cosas compró?
 if he-bought something which one of those three things he-bought

We dispute Jiménez's syntactic claim that there is any optionality in question strategies (movement versus *in-situ*) in Spanish: as we will see, the elaboration of an event presupposition has a syntactic counterpart in the topicalization of IP, whereas the restricted interpretation of the *wh*-quantification in the *in-situ* cases is related to the fact that *wh*-phrases *in-situ* are contrastively focused. As all contrastively focused constituents in Spanish (see Campos and Zampini, 1990; Uriagereka, 1995; Etxepare, 1997, among others), the *wh*-phrase in focus undergoes overt movement to an IP-external position. *In-situ wh*-strategies in Spanish are thus the product of quite a complex syntactic derivation: the *in-situ wh*-phrase undergoes focus movement to a left peripheral focus position, and this movement is followed by remnant topicalization of the IP. We will see that our analysis explains a wide range of syntactic phenomena belonging to the *in-situ* strategy. It also supports a restricted view of syntactic derivations, according to which optionality is a marked or altogether absent feature of the computational system, movement operations being directly enforced by grammatical

features, in the spirit of the minimalist program (Chomsky, 1995, 2001a, 2001b; but see Fukui 1993, for an economy driven notion of optionality).

1.2. French

The problem posed by the apparent optionality of mixed *wh*-question strategies, such as the one in Spanish or French, has been specifically addressed in work by Bošković (2000), Cheng and Rooryck (2000), and Mathieu (2002). Bošković (1997) argues that lexical insertion can take place at LF and proposes that French has a null C with a strong *wh*-feature which, due to the Last Resort Condition, is not inserted until LF. The late insertion of this C explains why elements do not move in overt syntax. The Extension Condition together with the locality of LF feature movement explains why *in-situ wh*-phrases are limited to matrix sentences. Bošković's analysis is meant to account for the following asymmetry²:

- (9)
- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|------------|--------|-------|-----------------|
| a. | Marie | a | acheté | quoi? | |
| | Marie | has | bought | what | |
| b. | *Marie | pense | que | Jean | a acheté quoi? |
| | Marie | thinks | that | Jean | has bought what |
| c. | *Marie | se demande | si | Jean | a acheté quoi? |
| | Marie | wonders | if | Jean | has bought what |

(9a) corresponds to the late (LF-) insertion of the null complementizer; the strong feature of the covert complementizer covertly attracts the *wh*-features of the *in-situ wh*-phrase. Feature movement is sensitive to the presence of an overt intermediate complementizer, so the derivation crashes at LF in (9b, c). However, we must say that the set of judgments in (9) does represent a widespread variety of spoken French, which in fact allows structures like (9b).

Cheng and Rooryck (2000) propose that *in-situ wh*-phrases in French are licensed by an intonational morpheme [Q:], which is underspecified as to its function as a yes/no question operator or as a *wh*-question operator. This underspecified morpheme gets disambiguated as [Q: *wh*] by feature movement at LF. The root properties of this morpheme account for why *in-situ* elements are only licensed in matrix clauses (*cf.* (9b, c)). The two accounts explain the apparent optionality in terms of a particular lexical property of French complementizers. Both analyses share the following features: (i) *wh*-phrases do not move in the overt syntax in the *in-situ* strategy; (ii) licensing takes place by feature movement at LF; and (iii) as a corollary, *in-situ wh*-phrases can only be licensed in matrix clauses. However, as we noted before, structures like (9b) are allowed in common spoken French.

Feature movement is also claimed to account for the following restrictions: *in-situ wh*-phrases in French cannot be preceded by quantifiers, negation or modals (a fact observed by Chang, 1997; Bošković, 1997; and Cheng and Rooryck, 2000).

- (10) a. ??Tous les étudiants ont rencontré qui ?
 b. ??Chaque étudiant a rencontré qui ?
 c. ??Il n'a pas rencontré qui ?
 d. ??Il peut rencontrer qui ?
 e. ??Il admire toujours qui ?

According to Cheng and Rooryck (2000), movement of the *wh*-feature creates an operator-indefinite configuration. Following Honcoop (1997), they assume that negation, modals and quantifiers create an inaccessible domain for the head of the chain and the indefinite to be linked (see also Beck, 1996)³. The basic LF-configuration of the sentences in (10) is a split operator structure (see Mathieu, 2002), where the *wh*-features raise to the matrix Comp and the indefinite restriction of the *wh*-phrase remains *in-situ*. This yields a LF-configuration where the operator c-commands the indefinite, but not the head of the chain. Again, as in the case of (9), the paradigm does not seem to represent common spoken French, where structures like (10c, d) can be fully acceptable while (10a) is odd whether the *wh*-phrase moves overtly or not. Generally speaking there may exist so far poorly understood differences in terms of contextual compatibility (as in the case of (9) above, too). Pending an assessment of the facts reported in Bošković's and Cheng and Rooryck's work, which may force us to rethink the syntactic status of *wh-in-situ* in French, the French facts stand in clear contrast to Spanish.

The *in-situ* analysis of postverbal *wh*-phrases in French also accounts for the fact that some adverbs, such as *pourquoi* 'why', are not good in that position:

- (11) *Il est venu pourquoi ?
 he is come why

One could assume, with Rizzi (1990), that the placement of those adverbs is necessarily IP-external, since they inherently modify propositional objects. If that is the case, the ungrammaticality of (11) follows naturally under the assumption that the postverbal position of *wh*-phrases in French is VP internal. VP-internal adjuncts cannot modify propositions (see also Cinque, 1999).

2. Syntactic distribution of *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish

The *in-situ wh*-strategy in Spanish seems to be of an altogether different type. As we will try to show in this section, *in-situ wh*-phrases are not truly *in-situ*. First, they are not just postverbal, but their position can be more precisely defined as the rightmost one (Uribe-Etxebarria, 2002). They can be embedded and show no intervention effect of the sort in (10). Furthermore, they show no argument/adjunct asymmetry in the purported *in-*

situ position of *wh*-phrases. Arguments and adjuncts do show some surprising asymmetries, though, which can easily be accounted for in terms of overt *wh*-movement. We will also see that binding asymmetries also suggest an overt movement account of *in-situ wh*-phrases. Finally, *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish also differ from the French ones in their interaction with other scope taking operators, such as quantifiers.

2.1. The sentence final requirement (Uribe-Etxebarria, 2002)

2.1.1. Unmarked word order and the position of the *in-situ wh*-phrase

In contrast with regular *wh*-questions, *in-situ* questions in Spanish show an intonational pattern similar to declarative sentences, with a clear intonational break between the *wh*-phrase, which is heavily stressed and has downward intonation, and the material preceding it:

- (12) [Declarative melody (Y) vosotros habeis comprado] [Interrogative melody qué]?

This intonational pattern goes together with some intriguing positional restrictions *vis-à-vis* the *wh*-phrase. *Wh*-phrases must be “sentence final”:

- (13) a. Sergio llegó el martes en bicicleta
 Sergio arrived on Tuesday by bicycle
 b. *Sergio llegó cuándo en bicicleta?
 Sergio arrived when by bicycle
 c. Sergio llegó en bicicleta cuándo?
 Sergio arrived by bicycle when

(13a) shows the unmarked word order in a declarative sentence, in which the temporal adverb *el martes* ‘on Tuesday’ precedes the instrumental adverb *en bicicleta* “by bicycle”. (13b) shows that the *wh*-phrase *in-situ* cannot occupy the natural, unmarked position of the adverb. (13c) shows that the “*in-situ*” *wh*-phrase is acceptable in the final, rightmost position of the sentence. The same generalization seems to apply to (14):

- (14) a. Pedro se ha casado con María por la iglesia
 Pedro CL has married with Maria through the church
 b. *Pedro se ha casado con quién por la iglesia?
 Pedro CL has married with whom through the church
 c. Pedro se ha casado por la iglesia ¿con quién?
 Pedro CL has married through the church with whom

We have to be careful here, though: cases such as (14b) become possible with a “right dislocation” intonation and a pause between the postverbal *wh*-phrase and the following constituent (which we represent with an intervening comma):

- (15) Pedro se ha casado ¿con quién?, por la iglesia
 Pedro CL has married with whom, through the church

The syntactic position of the right dislocated constituent is an important point, in view of recent analyses of right dislocation (such as Cecchetto, 1999) which argue in favor of an IP-internal position for right dislocated constituents. Under our analysis of the *in-situ* phenomenon in Spanish, in which the rightmost position of the *wh*-phrase is the result of two subsequent operations (focalization of the *wh*-phrase to an IP external projection and remnant topicalization of the IP), the position of the right dislocated constituent cannot be IP internal, as it would be carried along with the topicalized IP.

2.1.2. Right dislocation and Marginalization in Spanish

There is empirical evidence that right dislocated constituents are not inside IP in Spanish. Consider for instance the scope and referential properties of right dislocated constituents:

- (16) a. Pedro no (le) ha dejado nada ¿a quién?
 Pedro neg CL has left anything to whom
 ‘Who is the person x such that Pedro did not leave anything for him?’
 b. ??Pedro no (le) ha dejado ¿a quién?, nada?
 Pedro neg CL has left to whom anything
- (17) a. Pedro no (le) ha dado a nadie ¿qué?
 Pedro neg CL has given to anyone what
 b. ??Pedro no (le) ha dado ¿qué?, a nadie?
 Pedro neg CL has given what, to anyone

The structures in (16-17) show that certain elements, such as negative polarity items, cannot occur following the *wh in-situ*⁴. Negative polarity items make bad topics, as we know:

- (18) a. ??Nada, Juan no ha comprado
 anything, Juan neg has bought
 b. *A nadie, nosotros no visitamos ayer
 to anyone we neg visit yesterday

It is reasonable to suggest that the impossibility of right and left dislocations with negative polarity items should be somehow related. A straightforward way to do it is to assume that right and left dislocated constituents occupy the same syntactic position. Whatever causes (18a, b) to be ungrammatical then, also accounts for the ungrammaticality of (16b, 17b). We know however that right and left dislocations are not equal. In a recent analysis of the phenomenology of right dislocation, Cardinaletti (2002) distinguishes two

different syntactic strategies placing phrases to the right which she calls Right Dislocation and Marginalization. The two strategies are distinguished, among other things⁵, by: (i) the presence vs. absence of a doubling clitic (CL) (*cf.* (19)); (ii) the free word order of Right Dislocated constituents vs. the fixed order of Marginalized elements (*cf.* (20-21)); (iii) the scope of the postverbal element in each of the cases (*cf.* (22)); (iv) the position of objects in embedding constructions (*cf.* (23)); and (v) the possibility of extracting an operator from constituents placed to the right (*cf.* (24)) (Cardinaletti, 2002):

- (19) a. L'ho già comprato, il giornale. Right Disl.
 CL I-have already bought the journal
 'I have already bought it, the journal.'
 b. Ho già comprato, il giornale. Marginal.
- (20) a. Ce l'ha nascosto, il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto. R. D.
 there CL has hidden the child, the book, under the bed
 b. Ce l'ha nascosto, il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.
- (21) a. Ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto. Marg.
 b. ??Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.
- (22) a. *Non l'ha invitato Gianni, nessuno. R. D.
 NEG CL has invited Gianni, anyone
 b. No, non ha invitato Gianni, nessuno. Marg.
- (23) a. Che cosa l'hai convinto a fare, a Mario? R. D.
 which thing CL have-you convinced to do, to Mario
 b. *Che cosa hai convinto a fare, Mario? Marg.
- (24) a. *Che cosa_i l'ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t_i]? R. D.
 which thing CL has said, Gianni, that he-would do
 b. Che cosa_i ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t_i]? Marg.

As shown in (19) to (24), the presence vs absence of clitic doubling is associated with a wide range of syntactic differences. Those syntactic differences, according to Cardinaletti, are to be structurally analyzed in terms of two different configurations. In one (Marginalization), the right dislocated constituent has all the properties of an *in-situ* phrase: it does not involve a clitic (*cf.* (19b)); the order of the postverbal constituents is fixed, allowing only the unmarked one (*cf.* (20) vs. (21)); negative polarity items are licensed in their dislocated position (*cf.* (22)); objects must occur close to the predicate that selects them (*cf.* (23)); and finally, extraction out of marginalized clauses is allowed, unlike in the case of right dislocated constructions (*cf.* (24)). Cardinaletti proposes that marginalized elements are *in-situ* distressed constituents (see 25a), whereas right dislocated ones are high in the structure, their postverbal position the result of IP-movement (see 25b):

- (25) a. [_{IP} ha [_{AspP} comprato_i Asp⁰ [_{VP} Gianni t_i il giornale]]]
 b. [_{XP} [_{IP} l'ho comprato] X⁰ [_{DP} il giornale]]

Spanish is like Italian in that right dislocation need not have to be supported by a clitic:

- (26) a. Ya he comprado, el periódico.
 already I-have bought the journal
 b. Ya lo he comprado, el periódico.
 already CL I-have bought, the journal

But it fails to show the properties that Cardinaletti associates to Marginalization. As we already showed, right dislocations without a clitic do not license negative polarity items in the postverbal domain (*cf.* (16b), (17b)). Furthermore, the cliticless cases allow the postverbal constituents to be freely ordered (*cf.* (27)), they allow objects to be separated from their selecting predicates (*cf.* (28)), and disallow extraction (*cf.* (29)):

- (27) a. (Lo) ha escondido el crío, bajo la cama, el libro
 CL has hidden the child under the bed the book
 b. (Lo) ha escondido el crío, el libro, bajo la cama.
 (28) a. ¿Qué (le) has propuesto hacer, a Mario?
 what CL have-you proposed to-do to Mario
 b. ¿Qué (le) has propuesto a Mario hacer?
 (29) a. ??¿Qué cosa ha dicho, Juan, [_{CP} que haría t_i]?
 What has said Juan that he-would do
 b. *¿Qué cosa lo ha dicho, Juan, [_{CP} que haría t_i]?

In this regard, cliticless right dislocation constructions are similar to clitic doubling cases. We therefore conclude that right dislocation constructions in Spanish are always external to the IP, leaving aside the issue of the precise syntactic configuration that distinguishes them from one another.

2.1.3. Other *in-situ* constructions

The sentence final requirement is not operative in true *in-situ* configurations such as echo questions (30) and multiple *wh*-questions (31):

- (30) a. ¿Que Sergio se ha casado con quién por la iglesia?
 that Sergio CL has married with whom through the church
 b. ¿Que no sabes que llegó cuándo en bicicleta?
 that neg you-know that he-arrived when by bicycle
 (31) a. ¿Quién se ha casado con quién por la iglesia?
 who CL has married with whom through the church
 b. ¿Quién llegó cuándo en bicicleta?
 who arrived when by bicycle

The sentence final requirement is not exclusive of *in-situ wh*-questions. It also arises in contrastive focus. If we substitute the *in-situ wh*-phrases with a DP in (13) and (14), what we get is a contrastive focus construction:

- (32) a. Sergio llegó en bicicleta EL MARTES.
b. Pedro se ha casado por la iglesia CON MARIA.

Contrastive foci also induce the “right dislocation” of post-focal elements:

- (33) a. Sergio llegó EL MARTES, en bicicleta.
b. Pedro se ha casado CON MARIA, por la iglesia.

Those elements which cannot occur right dislocated are excluded from the postfocal position, *e.g.* polarity items (*cf.* (16b, 17b)):

- (34) a. *Sergio no llegó EL MARTES, con nadie.
Sergio neg arrived on Tuesday with anyone
b. *Pedro no se ha casado CON MARIA, por ninguna razón.
Pedro neg CL married with Maria, for any reason

Observe that this does not happen with *in-situ* questions in multiple *wh*-questions:

- (35) a. ¿Quién no llegó qué día con nadie?
who neg arrived which day with anyone
b. ¿Quién no se ha casado con quién por ninguna razón especial?
who neg CL has married with whom because of no special reason

The fact that contrastive foci show the same restrictions as (single) *in-situ* questions in Spanish and that the interpretation of *in-situ wh*-questions implies a restricted set of alternatives, as contrastive foci do (see Uribe-Etxebarria, 2002) lead us to conclude that *in-situ wh*-phrases are instances of contrastive focus.

2.2. Adjuncts and Island restrictions in *in-situ wh*-questions

As in Portuguese (Cheng and Rooryck, 2003), adjunct *wh*-phrases such as *por qué* “why” or *cómo* “how” can occur *in-situ* in Spanish:

- (36) a. Y tú has venido ¿porqué?
and you have come why
b. Tus amigos han llegado ¿cómo?
your friends have arrived how

The occurrence of adjuncts such as *why* in postverbal positions is problematic under the view that postverbal *wh*-phrases are truly *in-situ* in Spanish (as French shows). It is unproblematic under the view that postverbal *wh*-phrases in Spanish actually occupy a position in the left periphery as contrastive foci⁶.

Both adjunct and argument *wh*-phrases can occur postverbally in embedded domains:

- (37) Juan dice que María compró eso ¿en qué tienda/dónde?
 Juan says that Maria bought that in which shop/where

Argument *wh*-phrases can also be embedded in interrogative dependents, with matrix scope⁷:

- (38) a. Y tú no sabes si ha venido ¿quién?
 and you neg know if has come who
 'Who is such that you don't know whether he came?'
 b. Y Juan se pregunta dónde ha ido ¿quién?
 and Juan CL wonders where is gone who
 'Who is such that John wonders where he is?'

When embedded in *wh*-dependents, *wh*-phrases *in-situ* with matrix scope give rise to argument/adjunct asymmetries:

- (39) a. Y tú no sabes cómo llegó ¿quién?
 and you neg know how arrived who
 'Who is such that you don't know how he/she arrived?'
 b. *Y tú no sabes quién llegó ¿cómo?
 and you neg know who arrived how
 'What is the way/state such that you don't know who arrived in that way/state?'
 (40) a. Tú te preguntas con quién se ha ido ¿quién?
 you CL wonder with whom CL has left who
 'Who is such that you wonder with whom he/she left?'
 b. *Tú te preguntas quién se ha ido ¿con quién?
 you CL wonder who CL has left with whom
 'Who is such that you wonder who left with him/her?'
 (41) a. Tú no sabes de qué se ha muerto ¿quién?
 you neg know of what CL has died who
 'Who is such that you don't know of what he died?'
 b. *¿De qué no sabes quién se ha muerto?
 of what neg you-know who CL has died
 'What is such that you don't know who died of it?'

Given the fact that *wh*-adjuncts can be left *in-situ*, the reason of the ungrammaticality of the (b) cases must be directly related to the presence of a *wh*-dependency. The asymmetry is hard to state if we assume the *wh*-phrases to be *in-situ*. The facts however are easy to account for under a movement approach. In fact, the asymmetry is a well known one in overt *wh*-movement in Spanish:

- (42) a. ¿Quién no sabes cómo llegó?
 who neg know how arrived
 'Who is such that you don't know how he/she arrived?'
- b. ??¿Cómo no sabes quién llegó?
 how neg know who arrived
 '*How don't you know who arrived?'
- (43) a. ¿Quién te preguntas con quién se ha ido?
 who CL wonder with whom CL has left
 'Who is such that you wonder with whom he/she left?'
- b. *¿Con quién te preguntas quién se ha ido?
 with whom CL wonder who CL has left
 'Who is such that you wonder who left with him/her?'
- (44) a. ¿Quién no sabes de qué se ha muerto?
 who neg know of what CL has died
 'Who is such that you don't know what he died of?'
- b. *¿De qué no sabes quién se ha muerto?
 of what neg know who CL has died
 'What is such that you don't know who died of it?'

The striking parallelism between (39)-(41) on the one hand and (42)-(44) on the other can be straightforwardly accounted for under the hypothesis that the rightmost position of *in-situ wh*-phrases is the result of two subsequent movements: (i) overt *wh*-movement to the left periphery, arguably to a focal/*wh*-position; and (ii) remnant movement of the non-focal part to a higher topic position. (45) is an illustrative derivation:

- (45) a. [_{FP} quién_i F⁰ [_{IP} no sabes [_{CP} de qué_j C⁰ [se ha muerto t_i t_j]]]]
 b. [_{TopP} [_{IP} no sabes [_{CP} de qué C⁰ [se ha muerto t_i t_j]]]_k Top⁰ [_{FP} quién F⁰ t_k]]

(45a) illustrates the movement of the subject *wh*-phrase to a matrix scope position and (45b) remnant movement of the non-focal material to the highest topic position. If the first movement is not possible (as in (44b)), then the subsequent step is not possible either (*cf.* the ungrammaticality of (41b)). The logic of the argument leads us to expect that *in-situ* adjuncts will be bad in any context in which adjunct extraction is not possible. The effect we find in (39) to (41) can in fact be reproduced in other weak island configurations, such as factive islands (*cf.* (46)), negative islands (*cf.* (47)) or extraposition islands (*cf.* (48))⁸. All of them allow argument extraction.

- (46) a. *¿De qué/porqué_i sabe tu padre que murió Pedro t_i?
 of what/why knows your father that died Pedro
 'What is such that your father knows that Pedro died of it/because of it?'
- b. *Tu padre sabe que Pedro murió de qué/porqué?
 your father knows that Pedro died of what/why

- (47) a. *¿De qué/porqué_i no dijeron que hubiera muerto t_i?
 of what/why neg they-said that he-had-subj died
 ‘What is such that they did not say that he had died of it/because of it?’
 b. *No dijeron que hubiera muerto de qué/porqué?
- (48) a. *¿De qué/porqué_i tiene interés que haya muerto t_i?
 of what/why has interest that he-has-subj died
 ‘What is such that it is interesting that he died of it/because of it?’
 b. *Tiene interés que haya muerto ¿porqué/de qué?

The derivation proposed in (45) is well attested in contexts of contrastive focus. Consider for instance the following cases:

- (49) Tu hermano ha comprado/creo/parece/Juan dice que UN TOYOTA
 your brother has bought I-think/it-seems/Juan says that a Toyota
 ‘Juan says/I think/it seems that your brother has bought a TOYOTA.’

In (49), the focalized element is the only constituent following the complementizer *que*. The focus, on the other hand, is the object of a sentence which shows up in the matrix periphery, as a topicalized element. The only possible derivation for a sentence such as (49) is one where the focus moves first to an embedded preverbal focus position, and then the remnant is topicalized to the left periphery of the matrix clause:

- (50) a. Creo que [_{FP} [UN TOYOTA]_i F⁰ [tu hermano ha comprado t_i]
 b. [_{TopP} [_{IP} Tu hermano ha comprado t_i] Top⁰ [creo que [_{FP} [UN TOYOTA]_i F⁰ t_i]]]

2.3. Binding asymmetries

Consider the following paradigm:

- (51) a. Tus amigos han visto una foto de sí mismos
 your friends have seen a picture of themselves
 b. *Tus amigos creen que María ha visto una foto de sí mismos
 your friends believe that Maria has seen a picture of themselves
 c. *¿Quiénes creen que María ha visto qué foto de sí mismos?
 who-pl believe that Maria has seen a picture of themselves
- (52) a. ¿[Qué foto de sí mismos]_i creen tus amigos que María ha
 visto t_i?
 what picture of themselves believe your friends that Maria has
 seen
 b. Tus amigos creen que María ha visto ¿qué foto de sí mismos?
 your friends believe that Maria has seen what picture of themselves

(51a, b) show that the complex anaphor *sí mismos* ‘themselves’ is not licensed long distance (Reinhart and Reuland, 1991, 1993). (51c) shows that

the local licensing of the complex anaphor is preserved in *in-situ* configurations⁹. (52a-b) illustrate the fact that moving the *wh*-phrase creates new binding options. Following Chomsky (1993), we will say that these new binding options arise from the presence of copies of the moved *wh*-phrase in intermediate positions. Those intermediate positions are in a sufficiently local relation to the antecedent to allow coreference. Thus, in (52b), a copy of the *wh*-phrase *qué foto de sí mismos* occupies the intermediate Spec of Comp. The anaphor inserted in the *wh*-phrase is then sufficiently close to the antecedent to be bound by it. The cyclic licensing of the anaphor provides an elegant account of the contrast between (51c) and (52b). In the first case, the anaphor, inserted in the *in-situ wh*-phrase, cannot reach the matrix antecedent, since its binding domain is the embedded clause. In the light of that case, we must now consider (52b). If we assume that the sentence final *wh*-phrase is *in-situ*, it will be extremely difficult to account for the fact that the complex anaphor can be bound by the matrix subject. On the other hand, a movement account of those *in-situ* cases provides a ready solution for the grammaticality of (52b): cyclic movement of the *in-situ wh*-phrase to a matrix focus position allow for a copy in the intermediate Comp, as shown in (53).

- (53) [FP [Qué foto de sí mismos] F⁰ [IP creen tus amigos [CP (qué foto de sí mismos) que...]

Subsequent movement of the remnant IP past the *wh*-phrase masks the overt movement of the *wh*-phrase.

2.4. Intervention effects

Unlike in the French dialects/idiolects analyzed in Chang (1997), Cheng and Rooryck (2000), *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish show no intervention effect:

- (54) a. Todo el mundo compra ¿dónde?
 all the world buys where
 ‘Where does everyone buy?’
 b. Pedro alaba siempre ¿a quién?
 Pedro praises always who
 c. Los niños juegan cada día ¿con qué?
 the children play each day with what
 d. Nadie compró ¿qué?
 noone bought what
 e. Y tú no viste ¿a quién?
 and you neg saw to whom
 d. Y tú puedes comprar ¿qué?
 and you can buy what

Both Bošković (1997) and Cheng and Rooryck (2000) explain the intervention effect as a side effect of feature movement. *In-situ wh*-phrases are targeted for *wh*-feature movement to the *wh*-complementizer. For Bošković, feature movement is head movement (*cf.* section 1.2, above), and head movement cannot cross Neg. For Cheng and Rooryck (2000; see also Pesetsky, 2000), feature movement, attracting just the operator features of the *wh*-phrase, creates an operator-indefinite chain which is also subject to the intervention effects discussed in section 1.2. In any case, the Spanish facts show that the mechanism by which apparent *in-situ wh*-phrases take matrix scope in Spanish is not (covert) feature movement. Our analysis in terms of overt focus movement of the *wh*-phrase readily accounts for the contrast.

3. Scope interactions

An intriguing feature of Spanish *in-situ wh*-phrases is that they show no scope interactions with other quantifiers, unless the quantifiers are doubled with a clitic. Consider for instance the following cases combining an *in-situ wh*-phrase and a universal quantifier:

- (55) a. ¿Quién compró cada libro?
 who bought each book
 b. Compró cada libro ¿quién?
 bought each book who
 c. Cada libro lo compró ¿quién?
 each book CL bought who

Whereas one can answer a question such as (55a) either by providing a list of buyers and books bought (the most natural answer) or by naming the unique individual who bought each and everyone of the books, (55b) only allows an individual answer. That is, it asks who is the individual *x* such that *x* bought each one of the books. No other reading is available. A pair-list reading however becomes possible if we clitic left dislocate the quantifier. In other words, (55c) also allows an answer providing a list of buyers and books. The same contrast arises in (56). (56) involves a universal quantifier indirect object and an object *wh*-phrase:

- (56) a. ¿A quién han enviado cada libro?
 to whom they-have sent each book?
 b. Han enviado cada libro ¿a quién?
 they-have sent each book to whom
 c. Cada libro se lo han enviado ¿a quién?
 each book CL CL they-have sent to whom

Whereas the most natural reading of (56a) implies a list of books and people who received them, (56b) only admits an individual answer. It asks who is that individual to whom each and everyone of the books were sent. By clitic left dislocating the quantifier, we obtain a pair-list reading again. The configurations involving a quantificational subject and a *wh*-object give rise to ambiguous readings:

- (57) a. ¿Qué compró cada alumno?
 what bought each student
 b. Cada alumno compró ¿qué?
 each student bought what

Unlike in previous cases, here the configuration in which the quantifier precedes the *wh*-phrase, (57b), does give rise to a pair-list answer. The asymmetric behaviour of the subject in this regard must be linked to the hypothesis that preverbal subjects in Spanish are dislocated (Olarrea, 1996; Ordoñez, 1997), in a configuration analogous to the clitic doubling cases:

- (58) [TopP cada alumno Top⁰ [IP pro_i compro qué]]

If that is the case, then the actual configuration in which a pair-list reading becomes possible corresponds to the dislocated structure. The relevant generalizations are illustrated by the following table:

| | | |
|------|--|---------------|
| (59) | Wh... QP... t_{wh}... | |
| | (i) | Distributive |
| | (ii) | Individual |
| | QP... Wh... | |
| | (i) | *Distributive |
| | (ii) | Individual |
| | [QP]_i... CL_i... Wh... | |
| | (i) | Distributive |
| | (ii) | Individual |

The Spanish facts contrast sharply with the French ones as discussed by Mathieu (2002: 83). In French, the only possible reading for a sentence in which the universal quantifier precedes the *in-situ wh*-phrase is the distributive one:

- (60) a. Tous les enfants ont fait quoi?
 all the children have done what
 (i) *Which x, x a thing, every y, y a child did x
 (ii) For which pair <x, y>, every x, x a child, did y, y a thing

- b. Tu as donné tous les vêtements à qui?
 you have given all the clothes to whom
 (i) *Which x, x a person, you gave every y, y a piece of clothing, to x
 (ii) For which pair <x, y>, you gave every x, x a piece of clothing, to y

The French readings are the exact opposite of the Spanish ones. The Spanish facts have a straightforward account in our analysis, if we combine it with the standard claim that a distributive reading can only arise in a configuration where the universal quantifier c-commands the *wh*-phrase. In our analysis, the *wh*-phrase is in a scope position, and preceded by an IP which itself contains the quantifier. Consider as an example (55b), which we repeat as (61), and the proposed syntactic structure:

- (61) a. Compró cada libro ¿quién?
 bought each book who
 b. [_{TopP} [_{t_i} compró cada libro]_j Top⁰ [_{FP} quién_i F⁰ t_j]]

In the syntactic structure which results from the combination of focus movement and remnant topicalization, the quantifier phrase does not c-command the *wh*-phrase, and no scope interaction is possible. Now, consider the cases in which the quantifier phrase is clitic left dislocated. In those cases, the quantifier itself can be inserted in the syntactic structure outside of the IP, its place being occupied by the clitic. If topic positions can be recursive (or they provide more than one specifier, in accordance with the assumptions of bare phrase structure, Chomsky, 1995), the clitic left dislocated quantifiers sit in a higher topic position, from which they c-command the *wh*-phrase:

- (62) [_{TopP} [cada libro]_k Top⁰ [_{TopP} [_{t_i} lo_k compró]_j Top⁰ [_{FP} quién_i F⁰ t_j]]]

Interactions between *in-situ wh*-phrases and adverbial quantifiers never give rise to distributive interpretations:

- (63) a. ¿Qué compráis cada día?
 what you-buy each day
 b. Cada día compráis ¿qué?
 each day you-buy what

Whereas (63a) can be interpreted in a distributive fashion, as asking for each different day the things which are bought in that day, (63b) can only mean «what is the thing x such that you buy x every day». In our analysis, this must mean that they cannot reach the position of clitic left dislocated constituents. In fact, adverbial quantifiers sound very odd when they precede overtly moved *wh*-phrases (64a, b)¹⁰. Their natural position is after the *wh*-word (65a, b):

- (64) a. ??Cada día, ¿qué compráis?
 Each day, what you-buy
 b. ??Cada día, ¿quién viene?
 each day, who comes
- (65) a. ¿Qué compráis cada día?
 b. ¿Quién viene cada día?

4. Inversion

An expected phenomenon in approaching apparent *in-situ* configurations in terms of a movement analysis is the presence of inversion, a typical side effect of A'-movement (see Torrego, 1984, for Spanish; Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) for a recent comparative approach to movement related inversion). The presence of inversion in the *in-situ* strategies of other romance varieties, such as Bellunese, as studied by Munaro (1999) and Munaro, Pollock and Poletto (2001) serves as strong empirical evidence for the movement hypothesis. In Spanish, the overt movement of some operators such as *wh*-phrases and foci obligatorily induces inversion:

- (66) a. ¿Qué ha comprado Juan?
 what has bought Juan
 b. *¿Qué Juan ha comprado?

If *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish are the result of overt focus movement plus remnant topicalization, we would expect to find “derivational traces” of the overt focus movement operation in the remnant, perhaps as a postverbal position for the subject. This expectation is, apparently, not met:

- (67) a. Tu padre ha comprado ¿qué?
 your father has bought what
 b. *Ha comprado tu padre ¿qué?
 has bought your father what

That is, the derivation that we postulate for the *in-situ* cases consists of the following steps:

- (68) a. Focus movement + «inversion»:
 [_{FP} qué_i F⁰ [_{TP} ha comprado tu padre t_i]]
 b. Remnant topicalization:
 [_{TopP} [_{TP} ha comprado tu padre t_i]_j Top⁰ [_{FP} qué_i F⁰ t_j]]

In our terms, «inversion» must be understood as in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998): Spanish checks the EPP feature of T via verb movement (see also Suñer, 1994), and not through DP movement. Spanish preverbal subjects are thus not in Spec of TP (as in, say, English) but in a

“dislocated” position (see Barbosa, 1995; Ordoñez and Trevino, 1999; Ordoñez, 1997; Zagana, 2001, among others). Postverbal subjects are thus *in-situ*, and Case and agreement features of the postverbal subject are checked through Agree (Chomsky, 2000; 2001). So called “obligatory inversion” in the context of overt operator movement may be understood as simply the fact that there is no dislocation site below the focus phrase in Spanish. In this regard, Spanish is unlike Italian (Rizzi, 1997 : 296), as shown by the following contrast:

- (69) a. Credo che QUESTO a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire
 I-think that this, to Gianni, tomorrow to-him we-will-have-to tell
 b. *Creo que ESTO a Juan, mañana, habrá que decirle

Nothing can intervene between the focus and the finite verb/auxiliary in Spanish¹¹.

The issue then is why inverted subjects seem to be impossible in the context of *in-situ* questions, which, in our hypothesis, undergo focus movement. We will show that the restriction against postverbal subjects in the remnant is only apparent. Postverbal subjects in the remnant become possible if the preverbal domain contains a topic. Consider the following piece of dialogue:

- (70) Speaker 1:
 Juan compró un libro, un reloj y una guitarra para regalárselas a
 ‘Juan bought a book a clock and a guitar to offer them to
 Jokin, a Maite y a Oihana.
 Jokin to Maite and to Oihana;’
 Speaker 2:
 Y la guitarra, se la regaló Juan a quién?
 and the guitar, CL CL offer Juan to whom
 ‘And the guitar, Juan offered it to whom?’

As we can see in the *in-situ* question of Speaker 2, a postverbal subject is perfectly possible in an *in-situ* question. The only difference between the impossible inverted structure in (67b) and the possible one in (70) is that in the latter a clitic left dislocated topic precedes the sentence. The preverbal position of the subject is thus part of a broader generalization, already discussed in Uribe-Etxebarria (2002): the highly restricted contexts allowing *in-situ wh*-phrases in Spanish also require contrastive topics. A further manifestation of that generalization is the ban against null subjects in contexts such as (71) (Uribe-Etxebarria, 2002:221):

- (71) Speaker 1:
 Fuimos a la tienda a comprar huevos, leche y café.
 we-went to the store to buy eggs, milk and coffee

- Mi madre compró los huevos
 my mother bought the eggs
- a. Speaker 2:
 *Y compraste ¿qué?
 and bought-2sing what
- b. Y tú compraste ¿qué?
 and you bought what

The ungrammaticality of (71b) can be straightforwardly accounted for under the assumption that contrastive topics must be overt.

Given the generalization that *in-situ* questions require a contrastive topic, and that this topic position may be occupied by the subject (in fact, must, if there is no other topic available) the absence of inversion in the *in-situ* cases such as (67b) is just a consequence of (subject) topicalization. In (67a) therefore, the subject must be in a position external to the remnant moved TP:

- (72) $[_{TopP} \text{ tu padre } Top^0 [_{TopP} [_{TP} \text{ ha comprado } t_i]] Top^0 [_{FP} \text{ qué}_i F^0 t_j]]]$

NOTES

1. This is part of an ongoing research which began almost three years ago. Parts of this work have been presented at the *International Workshop on Wh-Movement* (Leiden/Utrecht, OTS) in 2001, and at the *Workshop on the CP-Domain* organized in the context of the *Fédération Typologie et Universaux* of CNRS (Paris, 2002). We thank the audiences there for helpful comments and discussion. Earlier presentations and contributions are acknowledged in Uribe-Etxebarria (2002). Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Ricardo Etxepare gratefully acknowledge financial support from grants 9/UPV 00033.130-13888/2001 and 9/UPV 00114.130-16009/2004 by the University of the Basque Country and BFF2002-04238-C02-01 from the MCYT (Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Spain). Ricardo Etxepare acknowledges support from the *Fédération "Typologie et universaux linguistiques"* (CNRS), through the project "L'architecture de la phrase" directed by Hans Obenauer and Alain Kihm.

2. Many speakers do not agree with Bošković's (1998), Chang's (1997) and Rooryck & Cheng's (2000) claim that embedded *in-situ wh*-phrases are impossible in French. Obenauer (1994) discusses a number of well-formed examples with embedded *wh-in-situ* (cf. (i)), including *wh-in-situ* questions in islands (cf. (ii)), arguing in favor of LF-movement (and pied-piping of certain islands, like the adverbial one in (ii)):

- (i) Tu penses [qu'il serait plus prudent [de passer par où] ?
 You think that it would be more cautious to go through where [=which way]]
- (ii) Il s'est défendu [en accusant qui] ?
 He defended himself by accusing who

As far as we know, there is no systematic description or analysis of the whole range of facts related to *in-situ wh*-phrases in French and the possible subsystems they may give rise to. For the purpose of this paper, we have concentrated on the dialect/idiolect identified and described in Chang (1997), Bošković (1998), Cheng and Rooryck (2000) and Mathieu (2002).

3. Honcoop's analysis is semantically based, and cast in the framework of Dynamic Semantics (Chierchia, 1995; Dekker, 1998, among others). Honcoop capitalizes on the fact that the operators which block the linking of the indefinite restriction and the *wh*-operator are the same which block cross sentential anaphora, and provides a unified analysis.

4. Zubizarreta (1994 : 44) attributes the ungrammaticality of (17b) and (18b) to the fact that negative polarity items such as *nada* "anything" cannot be destressed. Cardinaletti (2001) speculates that *nada*, and its Italian equivalent *niente* are weak elements, in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke's typology (1999). Being weak elements, *nada* and *niente* are forced to move from their base position. Cardinaletti observes that examples analogous to Spanish (17b) and (18b) improve in Italian with heavier n-words. Those heavier elements include [+human] n-word *nessuno* "anyone/nobody" and complex n-words such as *nessuna cosa* "any thing/no thing":

- (i) a. *Non ha fatto nessuno niente
- b. Non ha fatto niente nessuno
- (ii) a. Non ha fatto nessuno nessuna cosa
- b. Non ha fatto nessuna cosa nessuno

Observe that the Spanish cases do not improve with heavier elements:

- (iii) a. *No ha hecho JUAN, ninguna cosa
 neg has done Juan any thing
- b. *No ha hecho ESE TRABAJO, nadie
 neg has done that work, nobody

Nadie and *ninguna cosa*, on the other hand, can be marginally left dislocated, in which case they must be destressed:

- (iv) a. Nadie, no ha venido
 nobody, neg has come
 "It is not the case that nobody came"
- b. Ninguna cosa, es raro que hayan comprado
 any thing is strange that have-subj bought
 "Nothing, it is strange that they should have bought"

So the reason for the ungrammaticality of (17b) and (18b) cannot be the destressing operation per se. We note that both *nadie* and *ninguna cosa* in (iv) have a universal, quantificational reading, and not an existential one, as shown in the translations. Such a reading is to be expected in cases where the *n*-word takes scope over negation, as is the case in (iv). We could then wonder why the right dislocated cases do not allow for such a reading. In our analysis, the reason is clear: the sentence final, right dislocated *n*-word does not take scope over negation, which is inside the remnant moved constituent. It is not c-commanded by negation either, for the same reason. No reading (universal or existential) is thus licensed in the sentence final position of *in-situ* constructions.

5. Some of them are not directly testable in Spanish, such as *ne*-cliticization (i), or presence of Case features in certain colloquial varieties (ii):

- (i) a. L'abbiamo invitato noi, a Gianni
 CL have invited we, to Gianni
- b. Abbiamo invitato noi, (*a) Gianni

- (ii) a. *Ne lo/ lo ne ha comprado Gianni, uno
 CL CL CL CL has bought Gianni, one
 b. Ne ha comprado Gianni, uno
 CL has bought Gianni, one

In (ia), a Right Dislocation, the Case marker in the right dislocated constituent is obligatory. In (ib), a case of Marginalization, it is excluded. In (ii), ne-cliticization is possible out of a Marginalized constituent (showing the object is truly *in-situ*), but not out of a Right Dislocated one.

6. Contrastively focused adjuncts of the relevant sort are perfectly possible, as shown in (i):

- (i) a. POR ESO emigró mi tío y no por lo que tú mencionas
 because that emigrated my uncle, and not because what you are saying
 b. ASÍ llego mi tío, y no como tú dices
 thus arrived my uncle, and not as you say

7. Cheng and Rooryck (2003 : 5) observe that in Portuguese, the same configurations only show embedded scope for the *in-situ wh*-phrase:

- (i) O Joao quer saber se tu compraste o que
 the Joao wants to know if you bought what
 'Joao wants to know what you bought'

Cheng and Rooryck propose an analysis of Portuguese *in-situ* questions inside *wh*-dependents which is identical to their analysis of *in-situ wh*-phrases in French. The reason why *in-situ wh*-phrases in French and *in-situ wh*-phrases in *wh*-dependents in Portuguese should behave in the same way is related to the status of the Portuguese complementizer *se*, which as the French intonational morpheme of root questions is ambiguous between a yes/no question marker and a partial question marker. The indeterminate status of *se* in Portuguese forces the attraction of *wh*-features from the *in-situ wh*-phrases. Cheng and Rooryck (2003 : 8) observe that inside *wh*-dependents, *in-situ wh*-phrases undergo intervention effects, exactly as in French. We present two examples:

- (ii) a. *O Joao quer saber se a Maria nao viu quem
 Joao wants to know if Maria neg saw whom
 'Joao wants to know who Maria did not see'
 b. *O Joao quer saber se todo o estudante viu quem
 Joao wants to know if every the student saw whom
 'Joao wants to know who every student saw'

Also as in French, *se* cannot be related to an embedded *wh*-phrase *in-situ*:

- (iii) *O Joao quer saber se a Maria pensa [que o Pedro viu quem]
 Joao wants to know if Maria thinks [that Pedro saw whom]

In the absence of the indeterminate complementizer *se*, *wh*-phrases *in-situ* in Portuguese can be embedded (Cheng and Rooryck 2003 : 6):

- (iv) O Joao pensa que Maria viu quem?
 Joao thinks that Maria saw whom
 'Who does Joao think that Maria saw?'

The Spanish facts seem to support Cheng and Rooryck's analysis: Spanish *si*, unlike Portuguese *se*, is unambiguous as a question marker: it only marks yes/no questions. Accordingly, *wh*-phrases in *wh*-dependents behave as in main clauses, showing no intervention effects and no locality effects of the French type.

8. *Wh*-phrases *in-situ*, in Spanish (also in Portuguese, Cheng and Rooryck, 2003), can occur inside strong islands:

- (i) a. Tú has visto [al juez que detuvo ¿a quién]?
you have seen the judge who jailed whom
'Who is the x such that you have seen the judge who jailed x?'
- b. Tú te enfadaste [porque vino quién]?
you got angry because came who
'Who is the x such that you got angry because x came?'

This possibility extends to relative clauses and adjuncts:

- (ii) a. Tú viste [a un juez que se suicidó ¿por qué]?
You saw a judge who CL suicide why
'What is the reason such that you saw a judge who committed suicide because of that reason?'
- b. Se abre una investigacion [cuando alguien muere de qué]?
CL opens an inquiry when someone dies of what
'What is such that an inquiry is opened when someone dies of it?'

Given the fact that *in-situ* adjuncts are otherwise sensitive to islands, we have to reject the idea that somehow, the relevant configurations are immune to the usual constraints on extraction. Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (in preparation) argue that they reflect cases of massive pied piping, of the sort one can see in examples such as (iii):

- (iii) [Cuando alguien muere de qué]_i, dices que se abre una investigacion t_i?
when someone dies of what, you-say that CL opens an inquiry
'What is such that when someone dies of it, you say that an inquiry is opened?'

In (iii), the whole adjunct clause is moved from an embedded sentence to the left periphery, as if it were a *wh*-phrase. Several conditions holding of (iii) are shown to hold also of (i) and (ii).

9. This is unlike English (as described by Nissenbaum, 2000) or Portuguese, as presented by Cheng and Rooryck (2003 : 15). In both English and Portuguese, anaphors in *in-situ* positions can be bound "long distance":

- (i) a. Who_i thinks Mary was looking at which picture of himself_i?
b. Quem_i pensa que a Maria viu que fotografia de si_i?

This fact is crucial for the "covert movement" analysis of both Nissenbaum and Cheng and Rooryck. But the analysis cannot be applied to Spanish. Obviously, this raises the question of what exactly distinguishes English and Portuguese from Spanish. It seems unlikely that it has anything to do with the availability of covert movement, if such option exists. A different possibility is that it is related to the feature composition of the relevant anaphors, and the nature of long distance licensing. If this is the case, the basis for a covert movement analysis of (ia, b) is weakened.

10. Some speakers accept (61a, b), but in that case, they do not get a distributive reading. The sentences are interpreted as 'What is the thing x such that you buy x each and every day?'. The sentences in (62a, b) allow a distributive reading.

11. In this, focus operators behave differently from preverbal [+human] and specific *wh*-phrases, which do marginally admit intervening adverbs, scene setting topics and conditionals (Olarrea, 1996, among others):

- (i) a. ¿Quién, finalmente, va a hacer de intérprete?
who finally will do the translator

- b. ¿Quién de vosotros, si la noticia se confirma, irá a contársela al jefe?
who among you if the news gets confirmed, will-go tell the boss
- c. ¿En qué lugar, mañana, se va a celebrar el juicio?
in what place tomorrow will be the trial

REFERENCES

- ALEXIADOU, Artemis; ANAGNASTOPOULOU, Elena (1998). Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, V-Movement and EPP-Checking, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 3: 491-539.
- BECK, Sigrid (1996). *Wh-Constructions and Transparent Logical Form*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tübingen.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, Željko (2000). Sometimes in Spec CP, sometimes *in-situ*. In Roger Martin *et al.* (eds.), *Step by Step*: 53-88. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- CAMPOS, Hector; ZAMPINI Maria (1990). Focalization strategies in Spanish, *Probus* 2: 47-64.
- CARDINALETTI, Anna (2001). A second thought on *emarginazione*: Destressing vs 'Right Dislocation'. In Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*: 117-136. North Holland Linguistic Series 59. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- CARDINALETTI, Anna (2002). Against optional and null clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization. *Studia Linguistica* 56-1: 29-57.
- CECCHETTO, Carlo (1999). A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53-1: 40-67.
- CHANG, Lisa (1997). *Wh-in-situ phenomena in French*. M.A. Dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- CHENG, Lisa L.; ROORYCK, Johan (2000). Licensing *wh-in-situ*. *Syntax* 3.1: 1-20.
- CHENG, Lisa L.; ROORYCK, Johan (2003). Types of *wh-in-situ*. Ms. Leiden University.
- CINQUE, Guglielmo (1993). A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 239-298.
- ETXEPARE, Ricardo; Myriam URIBE-ETXEBARRIA (2003). In-situ *wh*-phrases in Spanish: Scope and Locality at the Right Edge. In preparation. Ms. CNRS & UPV-EHU.
- KAYNE, Richard (1998). Overt versus Covert Movement. *Syntax* 1: 128-191.
- KAYNE, Richard (2000). *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KOSTER, Jan; Eric REULAND (eds.) (1991). *Long Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HONCOOP, Martin (1997). *Dynamic Excursions on Weak Islands*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- JIMÉNEZ, María Luisa (1997). *Semantic and Pragmatic Conditions on Word Order in Spanish*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Georgetown University, Washington D.C.
- MATHIEU, Eric (2002). *The Syntax of Non-Canonical Quantification: A Comparative Study*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University College London, London.

- MUNARO, Nicola; POLETO, Cecilia; POLLOCK, Jean-Yves (2001). Eppur si muove! On Comparing French and Bellunese Wh-Movement. In press. *Linguistic Variation* Volume 58, Amsterdam, New York, Tokyo.
- NISSENBAUM, Jonathan W. (2000). *Investigations of Covert Phrase Movement*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- OBENAUER, Hans-Georg (1994). *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantificateurs*. Thèse d'État, Université Paris 8.
- OLARREA, Antxon (1996). *Pre- and Postverbal Subject Positions in Spanish: A Minimalist Account*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- ORDÓÑEZ, Francisco (1997). *Word Order and Clause Structure in Spanish and Other Romance Languages*. Ph.D. Dissertation, City University of New York, New York.
- PESETSKY, David (1987). Wh-*in-situ*: Movement and Unselective Binding. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G.B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In) definiteness*: 98-129. Current Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- PESETSKY, David (2000). *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- POLETO, Cecilia; POLLOCK, Jean-Yves (2003). On Wh-clitics, Wh-doubling and Apparent Wh-*in-situ* in French and some North Eastern Italian Dialects. This volume.
- POLLOCK, Jean-Yves (2001). Three arguments for Remnant IP Movement in Romance. In press. *Asymmetry in Grammar*, volume 1: Syntax and Semantics. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- REINHART, Tanya; REULAND, Eric (1991). Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective. In Koster and Reuland (eds.): 283-321.
- RIZZI, Luigi (1990). *Relativized Minimality*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 16. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- RIZZI, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*: 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- SUÑER, Margarita (1994). V-movement and the Licensing of Argumental Wh-Phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 335-372.
- TORREGO, Esther (1984). On Inversion in Spanish and Some of its Effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 103-129.
- TORREGO, Esther; PESETSKY, David (2000). T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- URIAGEREKA, Juan (1995). A Focus Position in Western Romance. In Katalin Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*: 153-175. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- URIBE-ETXEBARRIA, Myriam (2002). In-situ questions and masked movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2: 215-255.
- ZAGONA, Karen (2001). *The Syntax of Spanish*, Cambridge Syntax Guides, Cambridge University Press.
- ZUBIZARRETA, Maria Luisa (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article analyse les questions à syntagme-*wh* (*qu-*) *in-situ* en espagnol. Il montre que la position de surface de ces syntagmes est le résultat d'un mouvement visible vers une position focale dans la périphérie gauche. La position post-verbale dans laquelle les syntagmes-*wh* apparaissent résulte d'un mouvement postérieur par-dessus la position focale, dans l'esprit des propositions récentes de Kayne (1998, 2000). L'analyse défendue ici conduit à distinguer le phénomène *in-situ* en espagnol des phénomènes correspondants rencontrés dans les autres langues romanes, dont le français (Chang, 1997; Cheng et Rooryck, 2000; Bošković, 2000). Il est ainsi démontré que les mécanismes syntaxiques supposés déterminer la distribution des syntagmes-*wh-in-situ* dans ces langues doivent être modifiés dans le cas de l'espagnol. Dans une perspective comparative, les données de l'espagnol étayent une approche 'pluraliste' des stratégies *in-situ* (Cheng et Rooryck, 2003), selon laquelle la notion descriptive de syntagme *in-situ* recouvre un domaine grammatical non homogène. D'un point de vue théorique, notre analyse appuie l'idée que beaucoup de phénomènes analysés comme mouvement abstrait (en *Forme Logique*) dans la tradition du Gouvernement-Liage doivent être réanalysés comme cas de mouvement visible (masqué).

MOTS-CLÉS

Focus contrastif, mouvement abstrait, mouvement résiduel, dislocation à droite, espagnol, *wh-in-situ*.